

jobs and opportunities for American workers. Then there is the individual mandate tax that last year began hitting American families without government-approved insurance. For 2015, the individual mandate tax penalty is \$325 per person or 2 percent of household income, whichever is greater. In 2016, that tax penalty will rise to \$695 per person or 2½ percent of household income, whichever is greater.

But that is not all ObamaCare is bringing to tax season. This year, a full half of Americans receiving ObamaCare health insurance subsidies discovered they have to pay back some or all of their subsidies because they didn't estimate their income correctly. Ultimately, just 4 percent of households receiving subsidies had the correct subsidy advanced to their insurance companies. Unfortunately, the confusion and mistakes are par for the course for ObamaCare. The administration apparently finds the law so confusing that it sent out incorrect ObamaCare forms to more than 800,000 people. Yet the administration wants us to believe ObamaCare is somehow working.

We need to repeal this broken law and its trillion dollars' worth of taxes, and we need to reform our bloated Tax Code. We need to cut rates for families so that Americans can spend more of the year working for themselves and less of the year working for the Federal Government. We need to cut rates for businesses, both large and small. The U.S. currently has the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. That puts American businesses at a huge disadvantage compared to their foreign competitors, and American workers suffer the consequences—lower wages and fewer opportunities. Reforming both corporate and individual tax rates would go a long way toward making American businesses more competitive and opening new opportunities and higher paying jobs for American workers.

Of course, any tax reform measure should include reforms to the IRS. From mishandled customer service to the Agency's most serious offenses—the First Amendment violations involving the deliberate targeting of groups for extra scrutiny based on their political beliefs—this Agency, the IRS, is long overdue for reform.

The IRS Commissioner himself, John Koskinen, was quoted in Monday's Washington Post as saying: "We certainly can't afford to have taxpayer service be any worse than it is, although it is hard to imagine it being much worse than it is." That is a quote from the IRS Commissioner himself. When even the IRS Commissioner admits the Agency's taxpayer services can't get much worse, that is a signal the Agency is ripe for reform.

#### TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, before I close, I would like to take a moment to talk about what I think is a bright spot

for our economy, and that is bipartisan trade promotion authority. Previous free- and fair-trade agreements have been a boon to the economy, expanding opportunities for American workers and giving American farmers, such as many of those I represent in South Dakota, and manufacturers access to new markets for their goods. Nearly every one of those trade agreements was negotiated and enacted using trade promotion authority.

The idea behind trade promotion authority is very simple: Congress sets negotiating priorities for the administration and requires the administration to consult with Congress during that negotiating process. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the legislation instead of a lengthy amendment process that could leave the final agreement looking nothing like what was negotiated. That up-or-down vote is the key. That is what gives our trading partners the confidence to put their best offers on the table, which allows for a successful conclusion of negotiations.

Trade promotion authority expired in 2007. Republicans have been trying to get it reauthorized ever since. Currently, the administration is negotiating two key trade agreements—the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union trade agreement—that are unlikely to be concluded in the near future unless trade promotion authority is finally renewed. These agreements will expand opportunities for American workers and open new markets for American goods. A bipartisan reauthorization of trade promotion authority will help bring those agreements to a speedy conclusion, and that will be good news for American workers and American businesses.

The challenges facing our Nation are best solved when Members of both parties come together to find solutions for the American people. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues on trade promotion authority and other issues that will grow our economy, create better paying jobs for American workers, and increase the take-home pay of middle-income families in this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

#### NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reported the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. To the surprise of many people, including me, it was unanimously reported, which makes me begin to wonder just how much Iran nuclear agreement review there will be in this act.

I was an original cosponsor of the Corker-Menendez bill that would give Congress and the American people a voice in what is likely to be the most significant nuclear arms agreement in

this decade. I think the likelihood, as we move toward the agreement, as it appears to be structured, is that it won't be able to contain the desire of other people in the neighborhood—and maybe in other places in the world but certainly in the neighborhood—to be just as capable of producing a nuclear weapon as we allow Iran to be.

Supporting this bill does mean that Congress really gives the opportunity for these negotiations to advance, not Congress putting the brakes on these negotiations. Specifically, the bill would give Congress the opportunity to review and weigh in on a deal that has already been made. It does appear to prohibit the administration from removing sanctions while Congress reviews and while Congress votes on a final deal, if that is what Congress decides to do. It doesn't require Congress to vote, as I read it, but I look forward to having the people who unanimously voted for this in the Foreign Relations Committee explain how it really does involve the Congress as the Constitution would suggest the Senate would be involved. This does permit removal of sanctions only if the Congress passes a joint resolution approving the agreement, I have been told.

The new bill reported out of committee makes the following changes in the original bill. Under the new bill, the congressional review period isn't going to be 60 days, it would be 30 days. The new bill removes the provision requiring the administration to certify to Congress that Iran is not providing material support to terrorists plotting against the homeland or against U.S. entities.

We are continuing to be told: Well, that is a different topic. I don't know why that is a different topic at all. A nuclear-capable Iran that is supporting terrorism is obviously more dangerous than a nuclear-capable Iran that is not supporting terrorism. The weapon that you can see being built, the weapon that would compare to weapons we may have built, and other powers, in the past was perhaps not nearly as dangerous as the weapon being built that could be used by some terrorist.

This bill does appear to give Congress the ability to intervene but only to intervene after the parties have made the deal. I am not particularly offended by that. If this were a real treaty, the administration would obviously be negotiating that treaty and then would bring the treaty to the Senate for approval, as the Constitution requires and as has happened over and over again on treaties involving nuclear capacity, nuclear ability, nuclear build-up, or nuclear build-down. That is not a new thing for the Senate to deal with, but apparently nobody in the administration wants this to be this kind of treaty. Now, there is, apparently, a way to weigh in before it is implemented but in a way that I think we are going to have to look at very carefully if and when that legislation comes to the floor.